

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

CHRISTOPHER D. MACK,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROMERO ARANAS, *et al*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-02239-APG-EJY

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time, FRCP 6(b)/FRAP26(b). ECF No. 44. The Court has reviewed the Motion. No response was filed by Defendants.

The Motion seems to seek an enlargement of time to file a response to Defendants' Reply in support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. However, no response to the Reply is permitted by the Rules without leave of court and such a response (called a sur-reply), is strongly discouraged. *Kanvick v. City of Reno*, Case No. 3:06-CV-00058, 2008 WL 873085, at *1, n. 1 (D. Nev. March 27, 2008) ("a party must obtain leave from the Court before filing a surreply."); LR 7-2(b). The Court also notes that Plaintiff filed a Sur-Reply, without leave of court but to which no objection has been filed, on the same day as he filed the instant motion.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Enlargement of Time, FRCP 6(b)/FRAP26(b), (ECF No. 44) is DENIED as moot.

Dated this 18th day of December, 2020.


ELAYNA J. YOUCHAK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE